

6



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

6

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/925,703 09/09/97 ALLEN

D MICL: 024 (97-

┌

TM02/0823

└

EXAMINER

COE F. MILES
TROP PRUNER HU & MILES, PC
8554 KATY FREEWAY
SUITE 100
HOUSTON TX 77024

QPIE.G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED:

08/23/01

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

BS

Page 2 of Advisory Action

Art Unit 2151
George L. Opie

Application Control # 08/925,703
Attachment to Paper #22

Continuation of item 6 of Advisory Action:

The issue of the second configuration file and its scope as raised by Applicant has been addressed in the explanatory reasoning that discusses how the cited reference clearly meets this claim element as detailed in the Final Rejection, and Applicant has failed to amend the claims to distinguish over the prior art of record. It is noted that Applicant uses terminology that has broad meaning in the art, and thus requires a broad interpretation of the claims in determining patentability of the disclosed invention. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant should set forth claims in language that clearly, distinctly, unambiguously and uniquely defines the invention. The fact that Applicant has not significantly narrowed the definition/scope of the current claims implies that Applicant intends a coverage breadth of the claims that is met by the cited prior art. Consequently, the rejections as set forth in the previous Office Action are sustained.